APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/643,584	08/22/2000	Eric Schneider		9982

24226	7590	02/02/2004

ERIC SCHNEIDER
13944 CEDAR ROAD
258
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS, OH 44118

EXAMINER
TRAN, PHILIP B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/643,584	SCHNEIDER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Philip B Tran	2155	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 November 2003*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *21-39* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *21-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

Response to Amendments

1.   This office action is in response to the Amendment filed on November 19,

2003. Claims 1-20 have been canceled and claims 21-39 have been newly

added. Therefore, pending claims 21-39 are presented for further examination.

Specification

2.   The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is

clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis

for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or
> described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter
> sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would
> have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the
> art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in
> which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering

patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that

the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any

inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor

and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a

later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of

35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35

U.S.C. 103(a).

4.   Claims 21-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable

over Smith et al (Hereafter, Smith), U.S. Pat. No. 6,578,078 in view of Lyons et al

(Hereafter, Lyons), U.S. Pat. No. 6,094,665.

Regarding claim 21, Smith teaches a method comprising:

receiving, at a server, a request to locate a file from said server wherein

said request includes a Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) (i.e., the server

receives a message from a client requesting a resource via its URL reference)

[see Col. 11, Lines 57-61]; and

determining that said file cannot be located on said server (i.e.,

determining if URL has been redirected) [see Fig. 4 and Col. 15, Lines 25-30];

Smith does not explicitly teaches parsing at least one non-query URI

component from said URI, generating a search query from said at least one non-

query URI component, and providing results of a search engine request having

said search query. However, Smith does suggest browsing a Uniform Resource

Locator (URL) and extracting URL and determining if the URL is accessible by

not having been redirected then accessing the new URL and displaying the page

in reference to updated URL [see Smith, Fig. 4 and Col. 15, Lines 24-27 and Col.

15, Lines 52-60 and Col. 13, Line 25 – Col. 14, Line 7 and Col. 15, Lines 24-60].

This implies that the URL should be parsed and the new URL is generated and

provided for querying the requested resource.

Lyons, in the same field of locating resource on the Internet by processing

Uniform Resource Identifier (URI), discloses parsing the URI and testing

components for validity and then generating a new URI query for locating

requested resource [see Lyons, Fig. 2 and Col. 5, Lines 3-40]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate implementation of parsing URI string for generating a new query string, disclosed by Lyons, into the system of searching resource on the Internet using URL request disclosed by Smith, in order to locate the resource in an efficient manner when the requested content cannot be found on the server corresponding to the URI.

Regarding claim 22, Smith further teaches said request is a HTTP request and said determining that said file cannot be located on said server includes receiving an error code in response to performing said HTTP request (i.e., "Document/Page not Found" error when a web page has been moved and the prior URL is no longer valid in response to HTTP request from the client user) [see Col. 7, Lines 1-40]

Regarding claim 23, Smith further teaches the method as set forth in claim 21 wherein said URI is a first URI and said generating said search query from said at least one non-query URI component includes generating a second URI having a query component (i.e., first URL is valid and accessible while the content of first URL is not available then redirect mechanism will lead to second valid URL where the content is accessible) [see Col. 13, Line 25 to Col. 14, Line 7 and Col. 15, Lines 24-60].

Regarding claim 24, Smith and Lyons do not explicitly teach string length of said first URI is smaller in size than string length of said second URI. However, it would have been obvious to one of person skilled in the art to implement one URI string shorter than the other because it makes sense when the first URI includes only non-query component while the second URI includes both non-query component and query component.

Regarding claim 25, Smith further teaches the method as set forth in claim 21 further including providing at least one advertisement corresponding to said at least one non-query URI component before said providing said results of said search engine request having said search query (i.e., updating the URL link before processing query for displaying the new page) [see Fig. 4 and Col. 15, Lines 23-60].

Regarding claims 26-28, Smith further teaches said URI is the minimum form "scheme://SLD.TLD/FLD?index.htm" whereby SLD.TLD is a domain name, FLD is a first level directory path, and index.htm is a default file and creating said FLD and said default file when it is determined that said file cannot be located on said server and corresponding said default file to said results of said search engine request having said search query (i.e., scheme = protocol type, host = domain name, path = default file) [see Figs. 9A-9B and Col. 3, Line 49 – Col. 4, Line 38 and Col. 12, Lines 18-56 and Col. 21, Lines 10-14].

Regarding claims 29-31, Smith further teaches said URI is of the minimum form "scheme://3LD.SLD.TLD/index.htm" whereby SLD.TLD is a domain name, 3LD is a sub-domain of said domain name, and index.htm is a default file and creating said 3LD and said default file when it is determined that said file cannot be located on said server and corresponding said default file to said results of said engine request having said search query (i.e., scheme = protocol type, host = domain name and sub-domain, path = default file) [see Figs. 9A-9B and Col. 3, Line 49 – Col. 4, Line 38 and Col. 12, Lines 18-56 and Col. 21, Lines 10-14].

Regarding claims 32-23, Smith further teaches inputting said URI from a user interface element by inputting said URI into one of a browser location field, text box, command line, and speech to text interface (i.e., user browses a URL by typing in the URL) [see Col. 15, Lines 24-25].

Claims 34-36 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 21. In addition, Smith further teaches a processor (i.e., processing unit 122), a memory coupled to said processor (i.e., system memory 122) [see Fig. 6] and a browser type program (i.e., a web browser program) [see Abstract and Col. 6, Lines 12-32].

Regarding claim 37, Smith further teaches the method of claim 36 wherein said at least one non-query URI component of the first URI and said second URI is one of a scheme, domain identifier, port, and path (i.e., scheme = protocol

type, host = domain name, port, path) [see Figs. 9A-9B and Col. 3, Line 49 – Col. 4, Line 38 and Col. 12, Lines 18-56 and Col. 21, Lines 10-14].

Claims 38-39 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claims 32-33.

Other References Cited

5.   The following references cited by the examiner but not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A) Nielsen, U.S. Pat. No. 5,907,680, discloses checking spelling of URL when resource cannot be located.

B) Fogg et al, U.S. Pat. No. 6,321,242, discloses relocating document from old URL to a new URL.

C) Praitis et al, U.S. Pat. No. 6,594,697, discloses error page analysis when request for documents from the server cannot be found.

D) Murphy, U.S. Pat. No. 6,615,247, discloses parsing and processing URL request for locating resource such as web page.

E) Cohen et al, U.S. Pat. No. 6,654,741, discloses parsing and mapping URL request for locating resource such as web page.

6.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 21-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7.   Applicant's amendment necessitates the new ground of rejections.

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the

extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CAR 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY TO THIS FINAL
ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DATE OF
THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST REPLY IS FILED WITHIN TWO
MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE
ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE
THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE
ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO
37 CAR 1.136(A) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE
ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT, HOWEVER, WILL THE STATUTORY
PERIOD FOR REPLY EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE
MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Philip Tran whose telephone number is (703)

308-8767. The Group fax phone number is (703) 872-9306.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam, can be reached on (703) 308-6662.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application

should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)

305-3900.

PBT
Philip Tran
Art Unit 2155
January 23, 2004

VIET D. VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER